

R E M A R K S

The Examiner has rejected claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,705,723 to Lavie. Claims 2, 3 and 4 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of the present invention. The applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of the amended claims is not disclosed in Lavie for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 2 recites an apparatus for holding a spectacle lens. The apparatus comprises an elongate bridge having a first and second end. The bridge defines a bridge-side hole in each of the first and second ends of the bridge. The apparatus also includes a first fixing member attached to the elongate bridge, the first fixing member being adapted for insertion to a blind hole in the edge surface of the spectacle lens. The apparatus also includes a support line inserted in a groove formed in the edge surface of the spectacle lens and received in at least one the bridge-side hole.

Lavie discloses a device for mounting eyeglass lenses in which a filament 14 on each lens joins an end lug 16 of a bridge 18 to an end lug 20 of a articulated branch 22 of the foldable or type. Each lug 16 has at each of its ends two parallel holes 26 in which the filament 14 is inserted. The lug 20 of each branch 22 has at each of its ends at least one hole 32 for the filament 14 to pass through. Members 42, such as nuts and bolts, are fixed in the holes 36 and 40 in the lenses 10 rather than through the edge of the lenses 10 as in the present invention.

One of the advantages of the present invention over the prior art, as noted at paragraph 4 of the present application, is that during the formation of holes in the lens surface the lens may be chipped or damaged. Also, the act of threading a fixing member into the holes in the lens surface may crack the lens. Further, fixing members attached to the lens surface obstruct the field of view of the wearer of the spectacles and form an obstacle during cleaning. The present invention uses a bridge having projections for insertion into a blind hole in the edge surface of a

spectacle lens, and secures the lens within the spectacle apparatus using a support line. The edge surface of the lens is easier to drill and less prone to damaging than the lens surface and eliminates the problems of obstruction. In contrast, the device for mounting eyeglass lenses taught by Lavie shares the above-noted deficiencies of the prior art.

For the foregoing reasons and as previously noted by the Examiner, Lavie does not disclose or fairly suggest a bridge having projections for insertion into a blind hole in the edge surface of a spectacle lens as claimed in amended claim 2. As claims which depend directly or indirectly from claim 2, claims 3 -8 are also considered to be novel and non-obvious in view of Lavie for at least the same reasons given for claim 2. Accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2 to 8 be withdrawn.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Applicant
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By _____

David L. Newman (37,196)

CH1 10796912.1